

CA1
CC
-1991
N57

CAI

CC

-1991

N57



The Canada Council
Conseil des Arts du Canada

(CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY)



***Notes for a Speech by Allan Gotlieb,
Chairman of the Canada Council,
at the 1991 Governor General's Literary Awards
Ceremony***

*Winter Garden Theatre, Toronto
3 December 1991*



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114655186>

Thank you, Miss Tennant.

Your Excellency, distinguished guests, votre Excellence, mesdames et messieurs.

As the Chairman of the Canada Council I greet you and thank you for coming here today to help us honour the distinguished achievements of our writers.

As you know, the Council has the pleasant task of administering these awards on behalf of His Excellency the Right Honourable Ramon John Hnatyshyn, Governor General of Canada, and I wish to thank their Excellencies for honouring us with their presence on this occasion.

I know that all of you are most anxious for us to proceed to the announcements of the names of the laureates for 1991, but I would like to begin by thanking various participants and sponsors who have worked hard to make the administration of these awards a rewarding and fruitful endeavour.

In particular, the Canada Council would like to express its thanks to the Bank of Montreal and its Chairman, Mr. Matthew Barrett. The Bank of Montreal has contributed generously to the promotion of the Governor General's Literary Awards and again this year—for the fifth time in a row—is hosting the dinner in honour of the laureates, a worthy tradition at the end of the day's events.

I would also call attention to the skilled efforts of the forty members of the literary community who have served on both the French and English selection committees. The reputation of these awards lies in their hands, and once again, as I'm sure you'll agree, they have chosen well and with a great sense of what is most worthy to be honoured.

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been my privilege to have been a grateful witness to the remarkable growth of Canadian cultural life for some years. Who could have predicted the wonderful flowering of individual creativity, the lively debates over intellectual and arts issues, the strengthening of our private and public arts institutions—these are phenomena to recall with pride as we gather to honour our writers at this ceremony.

The cultural harvest of recent decades, rich in its diversity, strong in its power to nourish the spirit, has become one of the significant achievements of Canadian life. One takes for granted that everyone present today—persons committed to the arts—will accept this, yet I believe that, more and more, Canadians everywhere are able to share our vision. National and international recognition grows each year. In recent weeks alone, we have seen Rohinton Mistry named a finalist for Britain's prestigious Booker Prize for his novel *Such a Long Journey*. *Le Dortoir*, the stunning theatre-dance work of the Montreal troupe Carbone 14, which has been winning rave reviews on tours in Canada, the USA and Europe, recently received another honour when the television adaptation, co-produced by Toronto's Rhombus Media and the National Arts Centre, won an International Emmy Award in New York City. Also in New York City, the Toronto Dance Theatre's performance of works by Canadian choreographers has just been lauded by veteran *New York Times* critic Anna Kisselgoff. And in Paris, *Joe*, a creation by Montreal choreographer Jean-Pierre Perreault, has received overwhelming praise from the critics and the public.

The sense is taking hold that something quite precious exists in our vital artistic culture, something which we must make every effort to retain and develop. Increasingly, we are prepared to accept that our cultural heritage, especially the work of our distinguished artists in all fields, is at least as significant for future generations as is a working constitution and a balanced budget.

It seems to me that if our artists, our arts institutions and our arm's-length agencies, including the Canada Council, have largely escaped the present wave of cynicism, it is because they are understood to be promoting this valuable nourishment of the spirit without any hidden agenda whatsoever. One of the sources of pride Canadians can still muster is the pride they feel for their gifted artists, who enable us to integrate past and present experience and to define the deepest sources of our national and local identities as we face the uncertain future. Encouraging as all this may be, we cannot afford to rest on past achievements, for we live in a world where technological advances create a battle for the attention, I might almost say for the

soul, of the citizen and consumer. As T.S. Eliot wrote, we are likely to be "distracted from distraction by distraction."

I spoke of an almost miraculous growth of our artistic life. But miracles, too, require funding. More than ever we need to be aware that without continued and increased support the good efforts of our artists are in danger of remaining forever in a limbo of unrealized event. Unless our arts institutions are strongly supported, our prospects for retaining the quantity and quality of exhibitions, concerts, and stage performances we now enjoy are dim, while new developments will be gravely curtailed. Unless our publishers are able to survive and expand their activities, much of the excellent writing produced by Canadians today will never reach print. The result will be a frustration of our power to know ourselves, a sharp diminishment of our ability to define and enhance the best elements of our life-experience as Canadians.

Now I would like to address myself for a moment to the distinguished laureates in attendance here today, as well as to the other Canadian writers who combat very great odds to give us works of aesthetic beauty, as well as significant insights about the life of our time.

I would urge that our serious writers not be tempted to despair in the face of increasingly difficult working conditions. Endurance is a key, I believe, because every work that finds an audience broadens and strengthens the sense Canadians have that something valuable comes to them through the eternal miracle of the best words in the best order. Each incisive work of fiction or nonfiction, each sensitive translation, clarifies reality and brings us closer to the Utopian goal of transforming mere cries of joy or pain or protest into a truly human discourse.

Among the arts that promote the understanding-in-depth that our culture urgently requires at this time, literature stands very high. It is enormously to the credit of our writers that they have responded as inventively to the many shifts and changes in our society over the past decades. One of the latest of these, which is bringing a more pluralistic Canada into view, requires a process of understanding that bridges gaps among groups that may have had little previous understanding of one another. We must have new visions, new dreams, sharply

original perspectives on the life that is emerging among us. This is what we ask of our writers and, certainly, the works we are honouring today, and which are about to be named, give us confidence that we shall not be disappointed.

As you know, on November the 7th, the names of the finalists for the Governor General's Awards were announced. And now it is time to reveal the names of the laureates themselves, to whom I offer my warmest congratulations.

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I am pleased to be with you this morning to discuss some of the major cultural challenges facing Canada in the 1990s.

I believe the world is going to see the rapid acceleration of two existing trends, not fully compatible with each other: one towards universalism, the other towards particularism.

What is driving the engines of change in these opposite directions? For the answers we must look to the most basic elements of modern society—how we communicate, how we amuse ourselves, how we produce and what we value.

The determining forces at work are overwhelmingly economic and technological. Communications and information technology is battering down the walls of national sovereignty, the basic building block of the international order, creating first the phenomenon summarized by the code word *interdependence* and now what might more appropriately be described as *interpenetration*.

The basic reality is that the powers of the nation-state are increasingly less adapted to cope with the underlying forces of change in the lives of its citizens. The political space which constitutes the nation-state is becoming less and less relevant, more and more porous, as technology determines the patterns of human behaviour in their economic, social, political and cultural dimensions.

First, on the *economic* plane, larger and larger and fewer and fewer global transnational entities battle for market share in creating and satisfying demand for consumer products, and they carry no flag. Giganticism, alliances without boundaries, market domination through vastness of scale, and technological advance—all these phenomena are shaking the fundamental structures of the classic international order.

Second, on the *social* plane, the concepts of human rights and freedom have broken through the carapace of the corporatist state, undermining the structures of command and control through which powerful entities have exercised their authority for so long without true legitimacy. What cracked the armature of the world's foremost corporatist state, the Soviet Union, what destroyed its empire and is now the agent of its own disintegration, is neither guns nor power but the idea of liberty and human rights, which, with the help of modern technology, penetrated into the deepest corners of Soviet society.

Third, on the *political* plane, the world is seeing the movement to new forms of transnational political organizations. Europe is forming itself into a new political and economic union, a new federation, that will far transcend the unification of the current 12 members. The lineup of states waiting to apply is long and growing. Even proud neutral Sweden has formally joined the queue. We are already witnessing the greatest voluntary transfer of sovereignty in history.

Soon most of the EFTA powers, Austria, Sweden, Norway and others will be part of the federation and so will many of the Eastern Europeans. This will make a union of some two dozen nations with a population of a half-billion.

I believe also that, by century's end, parts of the USSR will belong to the pan-European federation.

Meanwhile, when we look beyond Europe to the other industrialized regions, we see now in North America the likely formation of a single free-trading area of the three major countries, the USA, Canada and Mexico—an event that I believe will happen before the end of 1992. This new single economic space will have a population of some 370 million and a GNP of seven trillion dollars. Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, the group known as Mercosul, are negotiating a free-trade area and will, in time, seek to link up with the North American free-trade area. Indeed Chile is already seeking a free-trade accord with the USA.

It is true that we are not talking here of economic or political union in the European sense. But these are not merely regional blocs that are forming. They are open-ended, new *legal* forms of political and economic space. In time, more developing countries will increasingly be linked to or drawn into the orbit of the super spaces. This does not mean most will formally affiliate or become part of the groupings, although many will. International organizations such as the World Bank, IMF, and GATT will continue to be of critical importance to their growth and evolution. But, inevitably, Latin-America, or a large part of it, will form into a single market, while Africa will forge closer links to its historic partner, Europe, and in Asia, the rapidly industrializing countries will, with Japan at the centre, move increasingly into wider forms of Asian economic organization.

Fourth, in the *cultural* sphere, for better or worse, technology is contributing to the creation and distribution of a universal software in music, film, broadcasting, and entertainment in all its forms, shaping a world in which fewer and fewer products, fewer and fewer programs, instantaneous in their impact and more and more dense, spread wider and wider into every corner of the globe. The *sine qua non* for the rise of the universal software has been the revolution in communications technology.

We live, we are told, in the era of the "information revolution," the era of the mass explosion of channels and circuits, wires and cables, satellites and mobile phones and electronic highways spanning continents and oceans; in the era of personal information systems in which individuals can create their personally tailored information universe; an era of ever more creative and individualized software, which allows us to interact with our own carefully created databases.

But even while this explosion of capacity takes place, the software, the programmes that determine our lifestyle, our habits and our hobbies, our very

way of thinking, do not multiply. The programming that dominates the electronic roads, the material that the satellite beams directly into homes, becomes ever more similar and ever more reductive.

There lies the paradox. The greater the capacity, the less individualized the content.

Canadians tends to see this phenomena not simply as homogenization but as Americanization. We are not entirely wrong.

We hear often from American "declinists," who tell us that American power is shrinking. The Americans, it is true, have lost some of their industrial primacy in recent years. But in the area of what is called "soft-power," the world of film, video, music and lifestyles, the Americans continue to dominate not just Canada but the world.

We must recognize that, in a highly competitive world, the capacity to produce universal entertainment is the true American genius, and its area of competitive advantage. It is not based on economic domination, for the simple reason that the USA ceased to dominate the world economically some time ago. The reality is that the American people, since the time of Hollywood, and now more than ever, have the talent to define the rhythm the world moves to, the heroes and heroines the world dreams of, the symbols and styles that influence our lives.

I don't suggest that it is *only* the Americans that produce the universal software. The communications revolution is resulting in a mass of global products, packages, cultural artifacts and fads emerging from other national sources, such as Japan, Italy and so on. I underline only the pre-eminence of American cultural power.

It is against the background of these extraordinary homogenizing tendencies that the urge towards particularism, collective self-expression and cultural identity is manifesting itself on a very broad scale. Some commentators speak of an explosion of "ethnicity," by which they mean the people's desire to identify with a community that is close to them. Others refer, more disparagingly, to "tribalization" when discussing the same phenomenon.

To such urges and desires is ascribed the resurgence of nationalism in different parts of the globe, the weakening cohesion of states and, virtually everywhere, the persistent commitment to cultural and regional identities.

The truth of the matter is that this urge toward particularism is very understandable, even inevitable. The forces that are creating transnational corporate entities of vast proportions, and international technological culture and a growing parallelism of life styles, are also driving the engines of particularism—the need to identify oneself, to reinforce one's identity, to know who one is and who one's children will be.

No country is immune from the operation of these twin forces of universalism and particularism. The impact of these twin forces is being felt in Europe, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, the countries of the Third World, and the United States. Truly, no developed country is experiencing their furious impact more than Canada.

Particularism, ethnicity, nationalism—stories about them dominate our daily news. They are, one could say, the flavour of the month, or year, or whatever. Croatia declares its sovereign independence along with Slovenia, the Yugoslavian federation teeters, the Balkans seethe, the Slovaks push for separation from the Czechs, nine Soviet republics declare for a Union of Soviet sovereign republics—and Gorbachev bows to the idea of such a reconstructed union. However, six Soviet states—the Baltic republics and Armenia, Georgia and Moldavia—dissent. Well, I think we know what they really want. Do we count the Ukraine among the nine acceding or the six rejecting? Who really knows?

Against these trends and background, I turn to Canada and the future of cultural expression in our land. Let me put my proposition simply: the communications revolution and the emergence of the homogenizing universal software make the role of the state in fostering the cultural life of nations more important, far more important, than ever before in history.

Of course the public role in subsidizing the arts is not a new thing. Massive public-sector support for great museums and opera houses and theatre has long been a major characteristic of the arts in many lands. Most democracies created national television broadcast services and established public or national ownership of various segments of the communications infrastructure such as telephone systems, cable satellite and so on. But as the electronic highways of the world exploded in number and satellites, and cable and video revolutionized the capacity to transmit entertainment and knowledge to human kind, it became much clearer that the ownership of the hardware might, in the long run, become less important than the production of the software.

The principal challenge for the state today in the cultural sphere is to promote and foster the creation of the content that is carried on those electronic systems and video screens. The spectacular growth of the homogenized universal software has made this one of the primary national tasks of our time.

During the past 50 years, probably the most significant decision by the Canadian government in the encouragement of national cultural creativity was the formation of the Canada Council in 1957 to foster and promote the enjoyment, study and production of works in the arts. This is an organization over which, as you know, I have the honour to preside.

An anniversary such as the tabling of the Massey-Lévesque Report—it occurred 40 years ago—provides us with an excellent occasion to pause and

reflect on the distance we have travelled in these past four decades, and ask ourselves where we are going in this final decade of the century.

It also offers an occasion today to examine our mutual responsibilities, as arts council and broadcasters, towards the continuing development and preservation of our culture, without which we will not survive as Canadians.

We might ask ourselves what role the Canada Council should play in the Canada of the 1990s, and what relevance the vision of Vincent Massey, Père Lévesque and their fellow commissioners has for us today.

Today, the Canada Council faces a double threat. Having been the national government's chosen instrument for artistic development and the major "motor" for the extraordinary transformation of the arts in Canada, the Council faces the possibility of being slowly starved to irrelevance or dismantled. This is a condition that I would describe as "death by decrement." This is the first threat to our existence.

The Council's parliamentary appropriation for the current year for its ongoing programs of support to artists and arts organizations is frozen, as it has been since 1986-87. In real terms, our funding has been shrinking for many years.

Severe deficits in theatres, orchestras, opera companies, galleries and arts organizations in every discipline are causing layoffs, reduced programming and curtailed plans. Individual artists—writers, musicians, composers, choreographers, dancers, visual artists, actors, directors—are bearing the direct impact of the Council's inability to respond to the needs of the arts community. The average real value of Council grants to arts organizations has declined by 30 per cent since 1978-79.

The Canada Council Board, at its quarterly meeting in Ottawa last week, expressed alarm at the precarious financial situation of Canada's artists and arts organizations. It unanimously approved a public resolution requesting "the Government to address urgently the financial needs of the arts community by responding to the Council's request for the additional funds required to enable it to help sustain the viability of artistic life and expression in Canada."

The second threat springs from the possibility or prospect of major decentralization to the provinces of the national responsibilities hitherto exercised by the Parliament of Canada, and exercised through the Canada Council. In other words, the threat of being dismantled.

You will be familiar with the recurrent rumours that, as part of future constitutional arrangements, responsibility for the arts and culture—and the monies involved—may be devolved to the provinces. At this point, the situation appears fluid and the picture not clear. However, it is important to be clear on why it is essential to have a national arts council.

The Canada Council has been a strong proponent of healthy provincial, municipal and private sector support for the arts. We remain so. Indeed, the Council has been a model often cited to encourage and secure support from other sources. Council funding is frequently seen as a "seal of approval" for corporations, private donors and other public funders. Financial support for the arts from the provinces and municipalities is a most desirable development.

But it is imperative, in my opinion, to maintain a strong and healthy *national* funding body as well.

This is so for several reasons.

First, such a body ensures equality of rights and opportunities across Canada.

Second, a diversity of funding sources helps the development of the arts and ensures greater diversity of creative expression. A clear benefit to artists is greater artistic freedom.

Third, a national body encourages higher levels of awareness, appreciation and judgment, since it draws on jurors and advisers from across the country, leading to balanced and well-informed decision-making.

Finally, while each region and each group has its own rich heritage and cultural traditions, an aggregation of separate parts does not constitute a nation. The whole must be greater than the sum total of its parts.

A national body is the only one that can encourage the exchange of ideas and works across provincial borders such as circulating exhibitions, national networks of film and video co-ops, public readings, book and periodical distribution, touring of performing arts companies, and national awards and prizes. In the words of a recent letter from a publishers' association, "It is because of the (Canada) Council that a British Columbia author can be published in Ontario and asked to give readings in schools and libraries in Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island."

A national body encourages exchange and collaboration between English- and French-language artists and arts organizations. Artists from Quebec and English Canada continually work together on Council's music, film, video, visual arts and dance juries and on all of Council's advisory committees to the mutual benefit of everyone concerned. English- and French-speaking readers and audiences have benefited from the Council's translation program, which has made books and plays by Canadian writers available in their language. The Council's programs have benefited francophone artists outside Quebec, and connected them with those in Quebec.

Canada's artistic population currently works in an increasingly diverse cultural and racial environment, and the challenge before Council is to ensure

that its programs are properly responsive to the voices—old and new—that constitute our community of artists.

A national institution facilitates understanding among different regions, beliefs and cultural backgrounds by fostering the free exchange of ideas and talents among artists and their public.

The essential momentum of the artist is to grow, and that process usually requires encounters with new audiences, other artists and points of view. Artists can't be restrained by geographical boundaries.

I maintain that, even if the provinces, which are widely disparate in the degree of their arts funding, were to use all the devolved money for the arts and culture, we would need, nevertheless, to re-invent a Canada Council. A national institution like the Council is not in itself the keeper of the country's soul. But in helping Canadians to create their distinctive culture, share their experiences and build common traditions, it is an *essential* national institution, a part of the glue that holds our country together.

At this extraordinarily difficult juncture in the country's history, when Canadians are suffering from divisiveness, deep uncertainty and a sense of dislocation, Canada—now more than ever before—needs to see itself, in its many different parts, in the artist's mirror.

As Massey and his fellow commissioners saw so clearly 40 years ago, the immense diversity of this land and its people must and can be, not its abiding weakness, but its greatest strength.

Those who can best communicate the intelligence, the passion and the most deeply felt emotions of Canadians were then, and still are, our artists.

The job of creation and communication is at the root of your responsibilities as broadcasters. The Massey-Lévesque Commission was, of course, also charged with examining broadcasting, and expressed concern, as the Aird Commission had done before it in 1928, about the vast importation of foreign programming. Massey wrote that while cultural exchange was excellent in itself, "It cannot be denied...that a vast and disproportionate amount of material coming from a single alien source may stifle rather than stimulate our own creative effort." Every task force and commission since then that has examined broadcasting has grappled with the latest manifestation of the same problem.

The struggle to get Canadian programs on the air, in the face of overwhelming odds, has been a particularly Canadian challenge as long as we have been thinking about broadcasting. As we know from our broadcasting history, each decade has brought new hurdles—technological, cultural and economic—that must be overcome, and now we face the ever-widening embrace of the universal software.

The volume of foreign-produced material has never seemed more daunting, nor technology more pervasive. Yet, in spite of the odds, Canadians have always managed to find ways of expressing themselves and communicating with each other. Private and public enterprises have been uniquely instrumental in this process. No group has played a greater role than broadcasters in fostering Canadian consciousness of ourselves as a nation.

Through the creation of a national broadcasting system, public and private, and through purposeful regulation, successive Canadian governments have attempted to ensure that the broadcasting system serves and informs the population of Canada in all regions of the country.

There can be no question but that the current trends—the communications revolution and the emergence of the homogenizing universal software—make the role of the state in fostering the cultural life of nations more important, far more important, than ever before in history. But they also make the role of the private sector in broadcasting more crucial than ever before. Your role cannot help but increase in its significance for our national development and survival.

As promoters and disseminators of cultural programs, broadcasters reach audiences far in excess of what an arts organization presenting live performances in a hall could ever hope to achieve. The arts must have broadcasters in order to reach wider audiences, and equally important, to educate and build the audiences of tomorrow. Conversely, it is essential that audiences have access to the best of what Canada's artists are producing.

I do not believe that "electronic" touring should ever replace the live experience of the arts. But it is a profoundly important complement to live touring. The example of the Metropolitan Opera broadcasts on radio and television, supported these many years by Texaco, is evidence of the way in which continued exposure through broadcast builds audiences for a complex art form.

If artists need broadcasters, the reverse is equally true. Broadcasters need artists and people trained in skills relating to the arts, such as technicians and designers. Canadians must recognize that we have, indeed, matured as a country, and while we lack the huge population of our neighbour to the south with its correspondingly huge pool of talent, we are far from lacking in skills, expertise, creativity and ingenuity. In this age of globalization, the only keys to survival are creativity, competitiveness and productivity, and we as Canadians have much to contribute to this global phenomenon. However, we will not become competitive by buying only American products off the shelf.

While public money is not and can never be the sole solution, it is an effective means of *stimulating* our competitiveness and creativity. Public funding through the Canada Council assists the development of artists and the production of works of art. Public funding also assists indigenous television production. The Council is providing the research and development support to enable

writers, performers, film and video makers, and other creators to achieve the highest professional standards.

An example of the interlocking nature of public and private support is Primedia's *Stage on Screen* series, where a number of Canadian plays, originally developed and presented by Council-supported theatres, are being filmed with private and public assistance for presentation on private stations across Canada.

These plays are giving broadcasters the opportunity to produce drama, in a form less expensive than made-for-TV movies, that reflects what is going on in their communities. And they enable the Canadian public, some of whom will never have the opportunity to see the plays in live theatre, to share in the best of our artistic endeavour.

Radio also has an essential role in presenting music, poetry and drama to ourselves. Radio is an excellent training ground for young artists, and in the area of radio drama, Canadians have developed an aesthetic that is uniquely Canadian. Unfortunately, too little radio drama is available anymore.

Two of the key issues facing television broadcasters are audiences for Canadian programming and the production of Canadian programs, in particular, drama. Recent studies show that viewing of Canadian programming in prime-time increased significantly between 1984-85 and 1988-89 (30 per cent on English-language television and 28 per cent on French-language television), although admittedly from far too low a base on the English side. Part of this increase can be attributed to the presence of Telefilm Canada's Broadcast Fund, which has also resulted in private broadcasters committing \$77.1 million directly to production financing through the Fund in the past four years. Viewing of Telefilm-assisted programs in prime-time grew by 300 per cent for English-language productions and 160 per cent for French-language productions between 1984-85 and 1988-89.

Most of what Canadians watch in prime-time is drama (about two-thirds of English-language viewing and one-half of French-language viewing). However, *Canadian* drama still makes up a very small percentage of all drama viewed in prime-time by English Canadians: 5.4 per cent in 1989, up from 2.6 per cent in 1982. The situation is very different for French Canadians: 47.2 per cent of the drama they watch is Canadian, up from 29.3 per cent in 1982. In 1988-89, Telefilm supported 40 per cent of all Canadian prime-time drama in English and 20 per cent in French.

It is clear that, as the quantity and quality of Canadian programs on private and public television increase, the share of total viewing captured by Canadian programs also rises. Public funding through Telefilm's Broadcast Fund has had an impact on increasing audiences, and it is essential that it be maintained.

A welcome development is the recent announcement of the Maclean Hunter Television Fund to assist independent production companies in financing the production of Canadian television drama series for private sector broadcasters.

While we are facing difficult economic times, and the private sector has been suffering considerably, your contributions to creativity and programming have never been more important. The relevance of your efforts can only become more evident in the years ahead. Without the private sector in broadcasting, and without your involvement, talent and experience, we will never meet the powerful challenges that lie ahead.

The Minister of Communications, Perrin Beatty, has agreed to invite private and public broadcasters, cable television operators, and government bodies to a summit meeting this fall. His timely invitation, and response to the Girard-Peters Task Force, underlines the need for partnership and planning among all the key players in this last decade of the twentieth century. It is crucial that we secure those strategies that will build an industry that can help create and deliver excellent Canadian work which will hold audiences and which can be marketed well in Canada and abroad. The summit will provide an opportunity to discuss various ideas and suggestions for strengthening the viability of the Canadian broadcasting system.

This is necessary because, for all the reasons I have described, the road ahead will be much more difficult than the paths we have taken until now in our history. These deep global forces I spoke of earlier will undoubtedly grow stronger as the years pass.

No group in Canada can play a more important role in the future in helping Canadians to define and appreciate our marvellous heritage and the privilege of being Canadian. Thanks to your creative contributions and commitment, Canadian cultural consciousness has attained the level that it has reached today. But that consciousness is far from adequate and a lot more will be needed to sustain it in the changing years ahead. You will play a privileged role and I am confident you will play it well.

3 1761 1146518 6



Amberg®

⊗ ESSELTE

57501

MADE IN U.S.A.



0 78787 57501 1